

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

**DONALD MASCIO** )  
                        )  
                        )  
**Plaintiff,**       )  
                        )  
                        )  
**vs.**                 )      **CIVIL NO. 08-cv-107-WDS**  
                        )  
                        )  
**C/O PRIDDY, et al.,** )  
                        )  
                        )  
**Defendants.**       )

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

**STIEHL, District Judge:**

Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding *pro se*, has filed an Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 together with a civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. However, Plaintiff has not submitted a certified copy of his prison trust fund account statement for the six-month period immediately preceding the filing of the complaint as required by § 1915(a)(1).

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff shall submit, within **THIRTY (30) DAYS** of the date of the entry of this order, a certified copy of his prison trust fund account statement for the six-month period immediately preceding the filing of the complaint. Plaintiff is **ADVISED** that in the event he has been transferred among institutions during this six-month period, it is Plaintiff's responsibility to obtain a copy of his prison trust account statement from each such facility and to forward it to the Court. Plaintiff is **FURTHER ADVISED** that his obligation to pay the filing fee for this action was incurred at the time the action was filed; such an obligation will exist whether or not Plaintiff is granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1); *see also Lucien v. Jockisch*, 133 F.3d 464, 467 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that upon conclusion of this thirty-day period, should Plaintiff fail to comply with this order, this case will be closed for failure to comply with an order of this Court. FED.R.CIV.P. 41(b); *see generally Ladien v. Astrachan*, 128 F.3d 1051 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997); *Johnson v. Kamminga*, 34 F.3d 466 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED:** March 26, 2008.

s/ WILLIAM D. STIEHL  
**DISTRICT JUDGE**